



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Blest be the married love, sacred and chaste ;
 Blest be the children's head, the mother's heart,
 The father's hope. Reach down the wanderer's staff, —
 Tie on the sandals on the traveller's feet :
 The wan-eyed morn weeps in the watery east :
 Gird up the loins, and let us now depart.

“ On Thursday, the 8th of December, I left Rome.” — Vol. II.
 pp. 170, 171.

ART. X. — *The Knickerbocker, or New York Monthly Magazine*, for June, 1847. Article on Professor C. C. Felton's *Edition of the Agamemnon of Æschylus*. New York : John Allen.

WE have seldom had occasion of late years to make any allusion in this journal to what has appeared in the pages of a contemporary periodical, whether American or foreign. An article in a magazine or a review is at best of but temporary interest, and it is seldom worth while to recur to it, after the lapse of a single week from the time of its publication, for the purpose of explaining, verifying, or refuting its statements. Especially have we avoided any thing like dispute or a protracted discussion of a single topic, either with another public journal, or with a pamphleteer, controversy being as unwelcome to us as it is wearisome or disgusting to most readers. We have not the slightest intention of changing this rule now, or of entering into any debate with the *Knickerbocker* upon abstruse points of philology, or upon the merits of an edition of a Greek classic. Our present object is only to expose the character of an article so remarkable for its violation of the laws not only of politeness, but of decency, for its unprovoked personalities and gross invasion of the sanctity of private life, that the writer of it deserves public rebuke and disgrace. He shall have the notoriety which he seems to covet, so far as the circulation and influence of this Review can give it to him. As he has affixed his initials to the article, and had announced quite generally, some months before its publication, and even, as we happen to know from several independent sources, some

weeks before he had seen a copy of Professor Felton's edition of the *Agamemnon*, that he intended to prepare a criticism on it which would annihilate the editor's reputation for scholarship, we are at liberty to point him out by name as Mr. Charles A. Bristed, of New York. He is quite young, having just completed his studies at one of the English Universities, where he acquired some distinction for his proficiency in Latin and Greek. Obtaining a prize or two at college has not infrequently had an unhappy effect on a young graduate who was not previously remarkable for discretion and good-sense ; but certainly we were not prepared for such an exhibition of vanity and impertinence as is now before us from one who has received even the elements of a liberal education. But Mr. Bristed shall speak for himself, that our readers may form their own opinion of his taste and manners. The following is taken from the commencement of the article.

"The Bostonians are proud of themselves, and justly so, on many accounts. Their high standard of morality is undoubted ; equally undoubted are their social virtues ; their enterprise is most commendable, and few would be disposed to deny them a large amount of general information and much learning, of the 'Society-for-the-Diffusion-of-Useful-Knowledge' sort. Unfortunately, the best of men often fall into strange delusions. The inhabitants of 'the American Athens,' setting up for universal geniuses, have, among other things, assumed to be the classical instructors of the whole American community ; while it is notorious that there is not a man among them who can write three pages upon any subject involving real scholarship without exposing himself egregiously. And not only do they claim to be *the* classics of this continent, but the *only* classics ; affecting to despise New-York scholarship, which is really very respectable, as far as it goes, and not altogether contemned on the other side of the water ; Professor Anthon's books being extensively read and republished in England and Scotland. And all this they profess to do, quite *ἐν παύρῳ*. Here, for instance, is Mr. Felton, who, we have no doubt, from all that has been told us of him, is a very excellent citizen and agreeable man ; a nice, pleasant gentleman, who knows a little of every thing, including a little Greek ; took the Greek Professorship at Harvard because it happened to be vacant, and could have filled any other chair with at least equal success." — p. 543.

It is hardly conceivable that a young man of highly re-

spectable family and connections, who has had the amplest opportunities for instruction, and has moved in good society, could so far disgrace himself as to write in a strain like this. The affected jauntiness of expression, the exquisite pertness and self-conceit that appear in every line of this passage, would disgrace the vainest coxcomb that ever attempted to inflict himself upon gentlemanly society. Is he foolish enough to believe, that the true representatives of scholarship and literature in the two cities are influenced by so pitiful a feeling as local jealousy, — that such men as the late John Pickering, the present President of Harvard College, the historians Sparks and Prescott, are actually envious, not indeed of each other, but of their brethren and compeers who happen to reside in a neighbouring city, — and, though there is a constant interchange of good offices among them, of sympathy, congratulation, and hospitality, that they really pine in secret at each other's success, and stoop to the low arts of intrigue and detraction, in the hope of destroying their rivals' fame, and the reputation of the good city of New York? If Mr. Bristed believes this, he is not only the most credulous of mortals, but is wholly incapable of understanding or appreciating honorable and gentlemanly conduct. Is he not aware, that Professors Edwards, Sears, and Felton, residing at a distance from each other, belonging to different literary institutions, and separated from each other by great differences of theological opinion, have been associated for years on the common ground of letters and scholarship, — that their names have appeared on the same title-page, as joint authors of an excellent work on Classical Studies, — and that President Woolsey, Professor Champlin, Dr. E. Robinson, Mr. Owen, and half a dozen others whom we could name, have long coöperated with them quite as heartily, and in a manner hardly less intimate? It is quite possible that a few ignorant pretenders in either city, though equally contemned in both places, may be scourged with rather more freedom at a distance from their homes than in their immediate vicinity, partly because the *clique* to which they belong may have some influence in deprecating home criticism, and partly, as in Mr. Bristed's case, because some of them may have respectable connections, whose feelings no one who is near them would wish to wound. But whatever may be the case with them, does he suppose that his fellow-citizens gener-

ally will be gratified, when a youth fresh from college — from an *English* college — assures them, with a very lordly and patronizing air, that “New York scholarship is really very respectable, as far as it goes, and *not altogether condemned on the other side of the water*”? Really! Who will say, after this, that Punch’s illustrations of “The Rising Generation” are only caricatures?

But we have graver matters than these to settle with Mr. Bristed, and we invite the special attention of our readers to the following passage from his article, coming immediately after the one already quoted. That it may be understood, it is necessary to mention, that, in September last, Professor Felton was married, a second time, to an amiable and accomplished lady belonging to a family of the highest respectability in Boston.

“Last autumn a dark rumor reached us that, emboldened by previous impunity, he was about to lay pen upon Æschylus; and happening to be in Boston soon after, we took pains to inquire whether such a fate was actually impending over the venerable poet. But the knowing ones waxed mysterious and uncommunicative; finally it was hinted that the Professor’s editorial labors were suspended indefinitely, by reason of a happy event that was speedily to take place; whereat we were glad, for the Professor’s sake — and still more glad for that of Æschylus. So Felton’s Agamemnon lay in abeyance till last month, when it burst out upon us in all its brilliancy. Truly, it would have been well for the Eliot Professor’s reputation, and for the reputation of American scholarship generally, could Joe Duggins’s ‘good time that’s coming’ have been so far anticipated as to allow him to marry half-a-dozen times over, provided it had in each instance insured a half-year’s postponement of this Æschylean and Herculean publication.” — p. 543.

If such a passage as this had appeared in one of the infamous newspapers which, under the name of “The Satirist” or “The Scourge,” have been published occasionally in London and New York for a few weeks, till the police could hunt them out and destroy them, we should not have been surprised. But we cannot express our astonishment that it should have been written by one whose education and position in society seemed to prove that he was a gentleman, or that it should have been allowed to appear in a magazine *once* so respectable as The Knickerbocker. Has Mr. Bris-

ted any excuse to offer for this coarse and brutal invasion of the domestic life of a gentleman whom he never saw, who has never given him any offence, and whose high character and standing are as universally recognized in New York as in Massachusetts? What was his purpose in inserting this passage in the midst of a pretended criticism upon an edition of a Greek classic? Did he mean to cast a slur upon the marriage, or to make an insinuation affecting the respectability of the parties to it? Let him offer some explanation of his motives and conduct, or submit in silence to the severest judgment which honorable men can form of them.

We gladly pass from this disgusting passage to the body of Mr. Bristed's article, and to an examination of his pretended scholarship. As Professor Felton would hardly thank us for an attempt to defend *him* from the assaults of such a critic, we shall look to the article only for illustrations of the writer's own pretensions and character. The arrogant and domineering tone which this boy-critic assumes throughout is as characteristic of him as the flippancy and impertinence of his language. We shall give a few specimens of his mode of speaking, not merely of the editor whom he professes to review, but of some of the veteran critics and philologists of Germany and England, — men who were teaching and writing Greek before Mr. Bristed was born. All the persons spoken of in the following citations have edited a portion or the whole of *Æschylus*; most of them are distinguished German scholars.

"Mr. Felton's favorite commentator is *Klausen*; an ingenious editor, certainly, but one given to *ex cathedra* dogmatisms, and utterly unsafe to depend upon. *Peile* the Eliot Professor seems to have half read, and not quite half understood. . . . And while attaching great weight to *Schneider*, indubitably the worst editor of *Æschylus* extant, and notorious as such throughout England and Germany, he seems absolutely ignorant," &c.

"Never mind what the sense or nonsense is according to *Schneider*; there can be very little doubt that the construction of *Peile* and *Klausen* (and *Paley*,) is the proper one."

"In default of something better we would suggest, &c., &c., — a conjectural emendation which we find pencilled in the margin of our lecture-room copy of *Peile*. Not being able to discover it in any of the commentators, we make bold to take the credit of it ourselves, till a claimant shall appear."

"Dear ingenious *Schneider*! How clever it is!"

“ ‘That eminent Hellenist,’ (as *Felton* calls *Mitchell*,) has made one of his usual slips.”

“It is not at all surprising that Messrs. *Schneider* and *Felton*, should have mistaken the construction here, but somewhat singular that *Klausen* and *Peile* should have done so.”

“*Boves locuti sunt!* *Schneider* and the *Eliot Professor* are actually right for once!”

These extracts speak for themselves. If a veteran scholar, of long-established and unquestioned reputation, should write thus, it might only be said of him that he showed very bad manners and bad taste; but when such language is used by one of Mr. *Bristed*’s age and pretensions, it is simply ludicrous, if not disgusting. This stripling, fresh from college and elated by the applause of his tutor, assumes all the airs, the brutality, and arrogance of a *Bentley* or a *Wolf*, without any of their genius. We shall attempt to teach him a little modesty by exposing a few instances of his dishonesty and ignorance.

Mr. *Felton* says, “The opening scene represents the palace of *Agamemnon*, at *Argos*”; upon which Mr. *Bristed* exclaims, with his usual flippant impertinence:—

“*Mycenæ*, Mr. Professor, *Mycenæ!* *Mycenæ!!* This error, which we have noticed as a common one among tyros and *dilettanti*, arises from confounding the *territory* of *Argos* with the city of that name.”

If so, it is quite remarkable that *Æschylus* himself nowhere mentions *Mycenæ*, while in this play he twice alludes to *Argos*. In fact, though *Homer* constantly places the residence of *Agamemnon* at *Mycenæ*, the tragic poets generally confound the two cities, *Sophocles* alone observing any distinction between them, and he not invariably. In proof of this, we cite *Strabo* and the author of the Greek Argument of the *Electra*,—two authorities whom we suppose Mr. *Bristed* will hardly overrule in so decisive a manner as he does all modern editors. *Strabo* says, *Διὰ δὲ τὴν ἐγγύτητα τὰς δύο πόλεις ὡς μίαν οἱ τραγικοὶ συνωνύμως προσαγορεύουσιν. Εὐριπίδης δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δράματι, τοτὲ μὲν Μυκῆνας καλῶν, τοτὲ δὲ Ἀργὸς τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν, καθάπερ ἐν Ἰφιγενείᾳ καὶ Ὀρέστῃ,—* *The tragic poets speak of the two cities, on account of their nearness, by the same name, as one; Euripides even in the same drama calling the same city sometimes Mycenæ, and sometimes Argos, as in the Iphigenia and the Orestes.* And

in the Argument of the *Electra*, another play relating to the family of Agamemnon, the writer says, ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ δράματος ὑπὸκειται ἐν Ἀργεῖ, *the scene of the drama is laid in Argos*.

And the modern editors, almost without exception, are of the same opinion. Stanley's language is, "*scena fabulæ Argis constituitur*." Schütz says, "*scenam dramatis Argis esse, ante Agamemnonis regiam, Æschylus ipse diserte annotavit*." Lest Mr. Bristed should reject the opinions of these two critics with as little ceremony or reason as he shows in pushing aside Klausen and Schneider, we will cite C. O. Müller, whose authority even this young iconoclast will hardly venture to reject. We quote from the English translation of Müller's *Dissertations on the Eumenides of Æschylus*, page 118.

"The very fact that Mycenæ no longer existed enabled poets, who delighted in connecting the realities of the present with the reminiscences of the past, to substitute Argos in the place of Mycenæ. Indeed, the Argives along with their conquest of Mycenæ had, so to speak, won the mythic and heroic splendor and glory of that famous city; and moreover the indefinite use of the word Argos by the earliest poets, sometimes in the extended, and at other times in a more limited sense, contributed its share to the transfer. In fact, *Æschylus is in this particular the most consistent of the tragedians; in his extant tragedies he never mentions the name of Mycenæ, but in the spirit of mythic fiction concentrates upon Argos all the dignity and splendor of the old legends*; whereas the other two tragedians are more lax in this respect, making Argos and Mycenæ sometimes distinct and sometimes identical."

Our readers are probably convinced by this time, that, in this instance, Mr. Bristed's ignorance is fully equal to his impudence.

"170. 'The ships were assembled in the harbor of Aulis, opposite to Chalcis, in *Bœotia*.' Annexation being the order of the day, Mr. Felton has stuck the very respectable island of Eubœa bodily on to the continent! We wonder if the 'pocket editions' of the classics, which Boston *scholars* are said to delight in, have any maps in them?" — p. 549.

This comment is dishonest, the writer of it wilfully seeking to make others believe what he knew to be untrue. Having occasion to speak of Aulis, Mr. Felton incidentally and very briefly reminds the student of its position, as "oppo-

site to Chalcis, — in Bœotia ”; just as one might hurriedly describe the situation of the town of Pawtucket as “on the opposite side of the river from Providence, — in Massachusetts ”; — meaning thereby certainly, not that Providence is in Massachusetts, but that Pawtucket is. Perhaps the meaning would be a little clearer, if the position of the two clauses of the sentence were inverted ; but every schoolboy knowing that Chalcis is not on the mainland, just as well as he knows that Providence is in Rhode Island, and not in Massachusetts, the editor did not guard against so obvious a blunder. Still, if Mr. Bristed had censured the note for a trifling inaccuracy of language, the criticism would have been fair enough, whatever might be thought of its importance ; but in commenting upon it as a gross mistake in geography, he makes what he knows to be a false charge. Of course, the phrase *opposite to* would have no meaning, if Chalcis were not on the other side of the channel ; if Mr. Felton had annexed Eubœa to the continent, Chalcis would be *adjacent to* Aulis. And as this channel, the Euripus, is described at length in this very note, the absurdity of the charge of “annexation” is still more manifest. It will be observed that Mr. Bristed himself, in this very passage, misspells the name of the island ; but should we be justified on this account in accusing him of ignorance both of the orthography and geography of Eubœa ? He has no more perception of the demands of fairness than of truth.

“262. ‘*πορευτοῦ* has, I suppose, the usual meaning of the verbal ; *πορευτὸς λαμπάς*, then, is a torch to be passed on, to be forwarded.’

“That would be *πορευτός*. *Πορευτός*, in its passive sense, means *travelled on*, *passable*, applied to roads. (We cannot now quote some desiderated passages from Polybius, but will engage to look them up before the congregated might of Boston shall have found answers to half the points in this review.) But here it has its active meaning, *journeying*.” — p. 550.

This criticism shows nothing but the writer’s ignorance. If the meaning were that the torch *ought to be passed on*, or *must be passed on*, then it would be *πορευτός*, or with the neuter *πορευτόν* = *δεῖ πορεύειν*. As Mr. Bristed apparently does not know the meaning of verbals in *τος*, we will refer him to so common a book as Kühner’s Greek Grammar, § 234. 1. (i): — “Those in *τος* denote either a completed

action or the idea of possibility, *which is their usual signification.*" Thus, from *ὁράω*, *to see*, verbal *ὁρατός*, *to be seen, visible*; and from *πορεύω*, *to send on, to set in motion* [Mr. Bristed seems not to know that the active form has this meaning], the verbal *πορευτός* necessarily means *to be set in motion, or capable of being set in motion or forwarded.* The "desiderated passages from Polybius" he will doubtless be able to find, as they are referred to in most dictionaries, to illustrate that peculiar and later signification of the word.

"339. *τείνοντα*. Butler has *τείναντα*; the present is better, for it describes the continued steady aim of Zeus; whereas the aorist would mean simply *aimed*."

"Is it possible that the Eliot Professor can be ignorant of the *frequentative* sense of the aorist?" — p. 551.

Of course, it is not possible; but it is certain from this passage that Mr. Bristed himself is entirely ignorant of an important limitation of the fact or principle to which he here alludes. The frequentative use of the aorist does occur in the indicative mood, *but not in the subordinate moods or participle*; and if it did, it could not apply here. The image as it stands, and as it is explained by all respectable commentators, is impressive and sublime; while the frequentative aorist — if such an aorist participle were possible — would make it ludicrous; for Zeus would then be represented as *drawing his bow frequently at Paris*, or as not hitting him till after repeated attempts. Every schoolboy knows, or should know, the frequentative sense of the aorist, as it is luminously explained in Kühner's ordinary "School Grammar," § 256. 4. (b). Mr. Bristed unwisely attempts to parade his knowledge of this familiar principle, and in so doing betrays his ignorance of its extent or limitations. We refer him for instruction to Coray, whose acute observation on the *Παρηγορητικός* of Isocrates, § 31, with Bremi's remark upon it, shows conclusively that there is *no* frequentative sense in the common aorist participle, unless a frequentative adverb is joined.

"484. *τῇ κατείργασται πέδον*. *πέδον* may be taken as the nominative or accusative; perhaps the nom. is better here."

"Rather better, inasmuch as *κατείργασται* is passive." — p. 552.

If this remark means any thing, Mr. Bristed intends to say

that *κατεργασται* is necessarily and always passive. A grosser blunder than this can hardly be imagined ; for *κατεργάζομαι* is a *deponent verb*, and its perfect *κατεργασμαι* is used either in an active or passive sense. Any dictionary will supply instances enough of its active signification, like this, from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (111. 5) : *τοὺς μέγιστα ἔργα κατεργασμένους*, *those who have accomplished the greatest works*.

"666. 'ἀγάλακτον, *without milk*, brought up by hand and attempted to be tamed.'

"ἀγάλακτον means a *foster-brother*. The *α* is *conjunctive* not *negative*." — p. 552.

To this we oppose the meaning given by Pape, who says, on the authority of Hippocrates, that the word signifies *milchlos*, "without milk." Referring to this passage in the *Agamemnon*, Pape defines it *der nicht mehr saugende, von der Mutter getrennte*, "that sucks no more, that is separated from its mother."

"816. *βουλήν καταρρίπτειν*. Two interpretations have been given to these words ; *should form a desperate scheme*, Blomfield, Schneider, and others ; and, *to overthrow the senate* ; i. e. the council of elders, who may be supposed to have been invested with the powers of government during the absence of the king. This is the view of Schütz, Butler, Wellauer, and Klausen. The objection to the former is, that it requires a forced meaning to be assigned to *καταρρίπτειν*, i. e. *to form rashly*, or *to push on desperately*, whereas its usual signification is *to cast down*. The objection to the latter is, that it is an abrupt and unprepared introduction of the council of *Γέροντες*, without the article *τὴν*. May not the difficulty be removed by taking *βουλήν* in its usual sense of *counsel, deliberation* ? Then *καταρρίπτειν βουλήν* would be to do just what a mob is most likely to do, *to cast down counsel* ; to reject authority and scorn deliberation." — *Felton*, pp. 143, 144.

"Blomfield's interpretation does *not* require a forced meaning to be assigned to *καταρρίπτειν* as any one may see who will take the trouble to look at his note on *Theb. 1030*. *καταρρίπτειν βουλήν* is *periclitari consilium*, the metaphor being taken from throwing dice." — *Knickerbocker*, p. 554.*

The note to *Theb. 1030* does not touch the question, ex-

* In all these extracts, we have allowed the accents, breathings, &c., to stand precisely as they are placed, or rather misplaced, by Mr. Bristed. Accentuation is probably not taught in the university where he studied ; he is almost as invariably wrong in this particular as a cockney is in pronouncing the aspirate.

cept to show, from Photius and Suidas, that κίνδυνον ἀναρῶν-ψαι means, as every body knows, *to run a risk, or stand a hazard*. But Mr. Bristed's assertion, into which he was led by an inadvertence of Blomfield, of "the metaphor being taken from throwing dice," is wholly indefensible. The words used in this game are βύλλειν, ῥίπτειν, and ἀναρῶν-πτειν, but *never* καταρῶν-πτειν. The ancients played games of this sort in the same manner as modern gamblers "shake props," by casting them *up* into the air from the palm of the hand; hence the use of ἀναρῶν-πτειν. This is finely illustrated by a beautiful picture engraved in the *Antichità di Ercolano* (T. I. tav. 1), where the players are represented in the act. Until Mr. Bristed can show that ἀνά is the same as κατά, that *up* means *down*, he cannot prove what he so dogmatically asserts. The game of dice is often spoken of, both literally and metaphorically; the passages where ἀναρῶν-πτειν is used are innumerable, the other more general terms being less frequent. In the Anthology, we find ῥίπτειν qualified by ὑπερθεῖν, so as to be equivalent to ἀναρῶν-πτειν. Ignorance of these games of chance is perhaps commendable in so young a man as Mr. Bristed; but whenever he feels old enough to study them, as they were practised by the ancients, we recommend him to read the treatise of Bulengerus on the subject, in Gronovius, Vol. VII., and Julius Pollux, IX. 7.

"944-949. 'Τὸ . . . ἐπαείδων; *but the mortal blood of a man which has once fallen before [already] on the ground, who can by incantation again recall?* — Ὅυδ' . . . ἐνλαβεία. *Nor with delay did Zeus stop him who knew aright to raise the dead*' [! !]

" In Klausen's first example, ἐσώζειτ' ἄν τὴν ἐνλαβείαν may be *loosely* rendered *cunctabunda mansisset*; but it is not what a scholar would call an accurate version, nor has ἐνλαβεία *properly* any meaning but *caution* or *precaution*. And by no possible concatenation of circumstances can ἐπὶ have an instrumental force. Ἐπ' ἐνλαβεία is *by way of precaution*. Cf. Aristoph., Vesp. 511. ὀφωνεῖν ἐπὶ τυραννίδι. *To buy fish with a view to (establishing) a tyranny*, where 'that eminent Hellenist,' (as Felton calls Mitchell,) has made one of his usual slips; and Lysist, 577-8, τοὺς πιλοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖσι. *Those who mat themselves together for the purpose of getting offices*. Ὅυδ' here means *else not*. All this is clear from the context, as we shall see on translating the whole passage. *The abundant gift of Zeus indeed, copious and from perennial furrows, is*

wont to dispel the affliction of hunger ; but the dark blood of man that has once already fallen upon the earth in death, who can call up again by incantation ? ELSE WOULD NOT ZEUS BY WAY OF PRECAUTION have put a stop to him that knew aright how to bring back the dead.” — p. 555.

We have omitted, at the beginning of the comment on this note, some of Mr. Bristed’s usual flippant impertinence, which has nothing to do with the passage to be explained, and have retained only what is essential to show the meaning of his criticism. Now, as *εὐλαβεία* signifies *precaution, delay, ἐπ’ εὐλαβείᾳ* may mean either *by way of precaution, or in the manner of delay*, — that is, *with delay* (*cunctanter*, as Klausen interprets it), *cautiously, hesitatingly* ; and this latter rendering is the one adopted by Mr. Felton in the note. Mr. Bristed is so incredibly dull as to understand “*with delay*” to mean “*by delay*” ; hence his emphatic declaration of the well-known fact, that “*by no possible concatenation of circumstances can ἐπὶ have an instrumental force.*” Of course, it cannot ; but it may often have the force of *with*, as in the phrase *ἐπὶ δακρύοις*, *with tears*, and a thousand others. As to Mr. Bristed’s translation of the passage, it requires a different reading from that in the text ; namely, that in Peile’s edition, *Ζεὺς ἂν ἔπαυσεν ἐπ’ εὐλαβείᾳ* ; while the reading in Felton’s edition is, *Ζεὺς ἀνέπαυσεν ἐπ’ εὐλαβείᾳ*. This difference Mr. Bristed dishonestly or negligently fails to notice ; that is, he first grossly misunderstands Mr. Felton’s explanation, trying to make it appear that he is inaccurate in not giving the version that he actually has given ; and then presents a translation of his own, founded on a different reading from that in the text.

Of a very obscure passage (950–954) Mr. Felton first gives at length the several explanations offered by Klausen, Peile, and Butler, and then adds : —

“I should translate it literally, *Did not fixed Fate hinder me from receiving fate more from the gods, my heart, anticipating my tongue, would be pouring out these things* ; i. e. did not the established order of things hinder me, a common man, from knowing, any further than mere conjecture or suspicion goes, the hidden purposes of the gods, I should, &c., — if I could win from the gods some further knowledge of what my heart forebodes, indeed, but cannot predict for certain, &c.

“Since writing the above note, I find this view of the mean-

ing of the passage confirmed substantially by Hermann. He says that the sense of it, in brief, is, Since one cannot know what is appointed by the gods, I dare not speak out expressly my suspicion, that Clytemnestra is preparing to murder Agamemnon. See Blümner über die Idee des Schicksals, pp. 37, 38, n. 6."

In commenting upon this explanation, Mr. Bristed leaves out all after the passage in Italics; that is, he stops short at the end of the *literal* version, which was hardly expected to be intelligible, and omits both the clear and full explanation of it which immediately succeeds, and the decisive confirmation of this rendering by the unimpeachable authority of Hermann. A more glaring instance of dishonesty and deceit it would be difficult to find in the writings of one who has any pretensions to scholarship or gentlemanly character. But let us see how he deals even with this garbled quotation.

"‘I should translate it literally, *Did not fixed Fate hinder me from receiving fate more from the gods, my heart, anticipating my tongue, would be pouring out these things.*'"

"Φέρειν *to receive!* The diametrically opposite sense of the word, which always has the idea of *bearing from one*, not of *taking to one*. μοῖραν πλεον εκ θεῶν. *Fate more from the Gods!* What Greek! what Greek!! This Professor will be the death of us!

"There is no reasonable doubt as to the general correctness of Peile's interpretation which is now usually received. Cf. Prom. 515, sqq."

"About πλεον φέρειν however, we have an idea of our own, viz., that it should be translated not *to lend assistance*, but *to prevail* (= πλεον ἔχειν) like πλεονος φέρεσθαι in Herodotus. Not being able to support this conjecture by any parallel passages we merely throw it out for what it is worth." — p. 556.

The remark on φέρειν shows how shallow are Mr. Bristed's ideas of the laws of language and the principles which regulate the expression of thought by words. The radical signification of φέρειν is *to bear*, — either by *carrying from* one, or by *bringing to* one, according to circumstances. One might safely say *a priori*, then, that it must sometimes mean *to receive*. Any lexicon will supply instances of this meaning, as in the phrase μισθὸν φέρειν, for μισθοφορεῖν, *to receive pay*, found in Aristophanes and Thucydides. Illustrations abound also in the tragic poets. We happen to remember two, and shall look no farther, as they are so clearly

to the point. In the *Antigone* (Woolsey's ed. 463, 464), the noble-hearted sister exclaims, —

ὅστις γὰρ ἐν πολλοῖσιν ὡς ἐγὼ κακοῖς
 ξῆ, πῶς οὐδ' οὐχὶ κατθανὼν κέρδος φέρει;
*For one who, like me, lives in many ills,
 How does he not, by dying, receive gain?*

And in the *Electra* (Woolsey's ed. 1485, 1486), —

τί γὰρ βροτῶν ἂν σὺν κακοῖς μεμιγμένων
 θνήσκειν ὁ μέλλων τοῦ χρόνου κέρδος φέροι;

For of mortals involved in woes, what gain can that one who is going to die receive (or, as Mr. Woolsey translates, derive) from delay? And now, what can be said of Mr. Bristed's dogmatical assertion, that this word “ALWAYS has the idea of *bearing from one*,” except that it shows his scholarship to be on a par with his manners and his honesty?

“979. ‘*Θυραῖαν τήνδε*, here at the door; *τήνδε* the demonstrative is idiomatically used for the adverb *here*. The accusatives agree with *ἐμέ* understood, referring to Clytemnestra.’

“The slight objection to this construction is, that it leaves *πάρα* utterly unprovided for.” — p. 556.

Mr. Bristed is so ignorant of the most common forms of expression among the Greek tragic writers, that he does not know that *πάρα* stands for *πάρεστι*. So frequent is this, that one can hardly read a page of one of them without encountering it. Thus, in the *Antigone*, 1179,

ὡς ὧδ' ἐχόντων τᾶλλα βουλεύειν πάρα — i. e. *πάρεστι*.

And, three lines farther on,

ἦτοι κλύουσα παιδὸς ἢ τύχη πάρα — i. e. *πάρεστι*.

Of course, the construction proposed by Mr. Felton is, οὔτοι σχολή πάρα (i. e. *πάρεστι*) ἐμοί, (ἐμὲ) *τρίβειν τήνδε θυραῖαν*. There is certainly another construction, though the one proposed by Mr. Bristed is quite forced, if not untenable. The choice lies between that of Mr. Felton and the following: — οὔτοι σχολή ἐμοί *τρίβειν παρὰ τήνδε θυραῖαν*, *there is no leisure for me to waste time by this foreign woman*.

“1221. ‘*Ὁ δ' ὕστατος . . . προεβένεται*.’ Schneider says, ‘*Ὁ δ' ὕστατος τοῦ χρόνου*, for ὁ δ' *ὑστατος χρόνος*,’ i. e. *the latest (latest) delay is best*.’

“Bad Greek; it would be *τὸ ὕστατον τοῦ χρόνου*. The common interpretation is the correct one.” — p. 557.

A more unlucky remark was never hazarded by one professing to be acquainted even with the elements of Greek. Schneider's explanation, on which Mr. Felton's version is founded, rests on one of the most frequent idioms in the language ; far from being bad Greek, it is particularly pure and idiomatic. Mr. Bristed may find the principle laid down in any school grammar ; for his instruction we quote from Kühner, § 264, R. 5, c. " The adjective is in the singular, and takes the gender of the substantive which it governs, instead of being in the neuter, e. g. ἡ πολλὴ τῆς Πελοποννήσου instead of τὸ πολὺ τῆς Π." Among the words thus used, he enumerates " *πλεῖστος and other superlatives.*" Mr. Bristed's dogmatism is so shallow, that he might be corrected by any schoolboy. What intolerable presumption is it, then, on his part, to pronounce magisterially upon the meaning of difficult passages in Æschylus, and to overrule by a word the opinions of the most learned critics in England and Germany !

But it is tiresome and humiliating to continue this examination of an article, the writer of which has put himself out of the pale of literary courtesy, and below the notice of respectable scholars. Till Mr. Bristed has made full reparation for the gross offence he has committed, till he has atoned for the reproach he has brought upon the very profession of classical studies in this country by this lamentable exhibition of petulance, ignorance, and bad taste, he will not be able to gain even a hearing in the world of letters. This public rebuke may teach him a useful lesson ; let him digest it in silence, and try to remember for the future that modesty and ingenuousness are no less essential elements of the youthful scholar's reputation and success than zeal and industry. Till he has learned this fact, he had better return to the primary department of instruction, and become a pupil of the very men whose labors he now ignorantly presumes to criticize. Professor Felton has not deigned even to notice this indecent and unprovoked assault upon his good name, and his friends will imitate for the future this dignified reserve. His gentlemanly character, kind heart, and genial manners are as widely known and highly respected as his varied accomplishments and accurate scholarship. He can afford to despise the flippant and ignorant attack of an unmannerly boy. A repetition of Mr. Bristed's offence, or an attempt to justify or palliate it, will not be noticed in this

journal, and will probably be treated with contemptuous silence in every other quarter.

Thus far, it will be observed, we have sought only to expose the critic's blunders and impertinence, without saying a word of the merits of the work which has been the object of this outrageous assault. No scholar needs to be told of the extreme difficulty of editing and interpreting Æschylus in a satisfactory manner, owing to the corrupt state of the text, and to the lofty style, gigantic imagery, and abrupt and harsh transitions of this great poet. The Agamemnon is pronounced by F. A. Wolf to be the most difficult of all his plays ; and Salmasius speaks almost with despair of its obscurity, which he pronounces to be greater than that of the sacred books with all their orientalisms. A crowd of able scholars have labored upon the emendation of the text and the interpretation of the more difficult passages, but with only partial success ; for in many cases no two of them agree in opinion. They are driven either to desperate conjectures in correcting the text, or to rendering in accordance with the general sense of the connected passages. Of course, every variety of speculation and opinion occurs, and dogmatism is so singularly out of place, that any editor who manifests it may be pronounced at once to be unfitted for his undertaking ; he cannot understand the nature of his task.

Mr. Felton's object was to furnish only a manual edition for the use of colleges, instead of an elaborate and perfected one for scholars. This purpose is sufficiently evident from the dimensions of the volume, which is a thin duodecimo, though printed with large and handsome type. The annotations show abundant learning and acuteness, without a trace of pedantry or arrogance. The results of the labors of other scholars are very freely set forth, though the editor does not slavishly follow in their track, but often propounds with frankness and modesty the independent opinions and conjectures which he has formed, after a careful study of the text. The only criticism we have now to make relates to two trifling faults of manner ; the one is, that his exuberant humor sometimes overflows in passages where it is not quite in place ; the other, that the habit, formed by long practice in the recitation room, of confining the student to a very close and faithful version of the text, has sometimes misled Mr. Felton into giving a translation of a difficult passage which is *so*

literal as to be ambiguous and obscure, or to violate the idiomatic proprieties of our language. In most cases, it is true, this crooked and involved literal version, which follows the Greek idiom more than the English, is immediately succeeded by a free and perspicuous paraphrase which brings out the exact meaning with great distinctness. But it sometimes stands alone, where it hardly tends to clear up the learner's difficulties. We have seen what advantage may be taken of this light fault by an illiberal and dishonest critic, whose only object is to misrepresent and to wound.

It would be idle to expect that all the opinions and conjectures put forth in the execution of such a task would be received by scholars without comment or objection. Professor Felton was far from entertaining so arrogant an expectation ; he looked for criticism, and welcomed it when it appeared. A fair and discriminating notice of the work, written with great candor, learning, and ability, was published a few weeks since in "The Literary World" at New York ; it expressed difference of opinion on many points, but in a proper and courteous manner. Though ignorant even of the name of his critic, Mr. Felton immediately wrote to him, under cover to the editor, to express his thanks for the gentlemanly tone of the article and for the general commendation of the work, and his equal obligations for the criticisms he had made ; remarking, that although the points noted had of course been fully considered while the notes were in preparation, they should be revised again before the book passed to a second edition, and the animadversions of the critic should receive that respectful attention to which they were fully entitled. The letter was answered in the same spirit in which it had been written, and the foundations of friendly intercourse were thus probably laid between two accomplished scholars by circumstances which in other cases, operating on persons of less frankness and magnanimity of spirit, have too often caused alienation or personal hostility. We are taking an unwarrantable freedom, perhaps, in lifting the veil from this incident of private life ; but the temptation was irresistible to lay before our readers so agreeable a specimen of the amenities of literature in strong contrast with the scandalous conduct which it has been our duty in this article to expose.